

MR3003-8
S.N. 09/993,682
Amendment dated 15 September 2003
Reply to Office Action of 20 June 2003

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 20 June 2003. Responsive to the objections and rejections made by the Examiner in that Office Action, Claims 1-2, 5, 7-11, 13, 18-19, and 21 are now amended for further prosecution with the other pending Claims. It is believed that with such amendment of Claims, there is a further clarification of Applicants' invention for this Patent Application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 11, 13, and 19 for containing certain informalities. The Examiner also objected to Claims 8-10 and 13 for containing unclear Markush language. As mentioned, Claims 8-10, 11, 13, and 19 have, along with other Claims, now been amended. It is believed that such amendments to these Claims obviate the Examiner's formal concerns.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Hatwar reference. The Examiner further rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hatwar reference. The Examiner additionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Claims 9 and 13 as being unpatentable over the Hatwar reference in view of the Fukuoka reference; Claim 11 as being unpatentable over the Hatwar reference in view of the

MR3003-8
S.N. 09/993,682
Amendment dated 15 September 2003
Reply to Office Action of 20 June 2003

Howard, et al. reference; and, Claim 16 as being unpatentable over the Hatwar reference in view of the Mishima reference.

As for Claims 2-5, 7, and 19-21, the Examiner merely objected to these Claims as being dependent upon a rejected base Claim, but indicated that such Claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims. Accordingly, Claims 2, 5, 19, and 21 have each been amended to independent form, incorporating the subject matter of their respective base Claims. These Claims, along with Claims 3-4 which depend ultimately from Claim 2, and Claim 20, which depends from 19, are thus believed to be in allowable form.

Claim 7 was amended to remove a typographical error, and to be consistent with the newly-amended subject matter of Claim 1 from which it depends. It is believed that Claim 7 is allowable in light of Claim 1, as now amended.

Each of the original independent Claims, Claims 1 and 18, has now been amended to more clearly recite among its features a white light emitting organic EL device (or a method of fabricating, in the case of Claim 18) “wherein a first light is emitted by...[a] first dopant” of a luminescent layer, and “a second light different in color from said first light is emitted by...[a] second dopant” of an electronic transporting layer. As each newly-amended independent Claim 1 and 18 also now more clearly recites, a “blue” third

light “different in color from said second light is emitted by said luminescent layer when the device is applied with a bias voltage.”

The full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by Applicants’ pending Claims are nowhere disclosed by the cited references. Note, for instance, that the primarily-cited Hatwar reference prescribes each of its colors to be emitted via a particular dopant. Hatwar prescribes its blue light in particular to be emitted by such a dopant rather than being “emitted by said luminescent layer” itself, as each of Applicants’ Claims 1 and 18 now more clearly recites.

Given such contrary teachings of the primarily-cited Hatwar reference, the secondarily-cited Fukuoka, et al., Howard, et al., and Mishima references are found to be quite ineffectual to the present patentability analysis. These secondary references were merely relied upon for disclosing particular dopant and electron transport layer materials.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the cited references, even when considered together, fail to disclose the unique combination of features now more clearly recited by Applicants’ pending Claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

MR3003-8
S.N. 09/993,682
Amendment dated 15 September 2003
Reply to Office Action of 20 June 2003

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application as been placed in condition
for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee

Registration #40,262

Dated: 9/15/03

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
JYL/ds



04586

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE